INTRODUCTION

During the year, the Museum has received from Dr. Haddon a gift of the first importance in the shape of his collection of several thousands of anthropological photographs, accumulated by him over a very long period and from every part of the world. In honour of Dr. Haddon’s eightieth birthday these photographs had been put in order, prints made from the negatives, and the whole collection catalogued, uniformly mounted, and arranged in a cabinet specially made for them. The large number of photographs already in the Museum have now been incorporated in the collection, many hundreds have been added, chiefly by friends of Dr. Haddon, and it is hoped that the collection, which will be called the Haddon Photographic Collection, will steadily increase. It is already one of the most comprehensive in existence.

This paper starts inside a drawer. One of a series of custom-built wooden units, the solid drawer was initially made in 1935 to mark the eightieth birthday of Alfred Cort Haddon (1855–1940), an ethnologist who worked closely with what is now the Cambridge University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology (CUMAA) from 1892 to 1926. Whilst the Haddon Photographic Collection has continued to grow over the years, the form of Haddon’s original
donation remains intact (figure 1). Now housed in an air-conditioned room of the museum, the drawer labeled “New Hebrides” contains 589 copy-prints—paper images, mounted two or more per gray board, uniformly marked with hand-written accession numbers (figure 2).

All of the images in the drawer were taken in the Melanesian archipelago now known as Vanuatu between 1908 and 1935. Over two-thirds of them were taken on the island of Malakula, in the north-central region of the archipelago (see figure 3). Malakula was to become a well-established visual ‘lure’ for the diverse photographers that contributed to Haddon’s collection, and for future generations of anthropological researchers working both in Cambridge and in Vanuatu.3

3 Up until 1980, when Vanuatu achieved independence, and beyond in some publications, the conventional orthography for this island was “Malekula.” Since independence, “Malakula” has become the established orthography. Throughout this essay I use this convention, except in quotations that use the old spelling. Similarly, I refer to the “New Hebrides” only in the context of secondary sources, and Vanuatu when referring to the archipelago more generally. I hope that this does not confuse readers. Contemporary citizens of Vanuatu are called ni-Vanuatu and speak (at least) Bislama, the national pidgin English, alongside French and/or English and their local language. The current population is just over 200,000, with roughly 110 different languages (not dialects) spoken. All but two Polynesian outliers fall into the Austronesian language group (see Tryon 1996). Linguistically, it remains one of the most diverse parts of the world.
In order to write this paper, I moved from my own fieldwork on visual production in Vanuatu deep into Haddon’s drawer, and back out again into the widening body of academic engagement with photographic images (e.g., Sontag 1979; Barthes 1993 [1981]; Sekula 1984; Tagg 1988; Pinney 1997; Edwards 2001). Tagg has argued that “photography as such has no identity” but is instead colonized by external interest groups that put it to work in its name (Tagg 1988: 63, as discussed by Wright 2004: 74). In this context, particular attention has been paid to the “parallel histories” of anthropology and photography (Pinney 1992; see also Edwards 1992). An analytic return to the colonial visual archive has fore-grounded the shared interests of early anthropologists and photographers, and their audiences, in ‘inscribing’ reality, and in using this as ‘evidence’ in diverse representational projects, for example,
assisting in the constitution of ideas about race, nationalism, and colonialism (see Edwards 2001; Pinney 2003; Fusco and Wallis 2003). Such critical engagements with photographic images also highlight that in addition to being viewed as authentic evidence, or representations of objective reality, photographs can be understood as subjective, malleable, and reflexive embodiments of personal experiences (see Wright 1997), and as both the products of, and important players within, cultural and political exchanges (see Poole 1997). Photographs, like ethnographies, may thus be read and experienced as products of an “impossible science of the unique being” (Barthes 1993: 70–71; Pinney, Poignant, and Wright 1996). Photography may be seen as an ideal technology for capturing some of the tensions that surround knowledge formation and the cultural and political encounters endemic to the discipline of anthropology.

In this paper, I build upon these understandings of photography to argue that photographic images are creative actors within, not merely representations of, the development of ‘anthropological’ ideas. I also emphasize the complicity of photographic practice in engendering a network of cross-cultural imag(inar)ies—in this case an imaginary that emerged during a twenty-year period of interaction between the island of Malakula and CUMAA. In addition to focusing on the interpretive resonances of photographic objects as they move across time and space, I analyze the importance of photographic practices in forging social fields. Making photographs not only objectifies imaginations, but mediates particular kinds of relationships and, by extension, understanding between people. The photographs produced on Malakula by men associated in diverse ways with CUMAA were not only illustrations of contemporary anthropological thought in Cambridge; their production and circulation also assisted in the creation of some of the social, political, and cultural relationships between observer and observed, student and subject, that formed and continue to form the very subject matter of anthropology itself. In this context, photographs evoke an awareness of how objectivity is socially produced and visually mediated. Image taking and making is far more than a representational technology—images and their production play a vibrant part in the scenes that at first glance they seem merely to record (see Pinney 2003: 14).

PHOTOGRAPHIC ANALOGIES

Photographs have long played an important mediating role within wider networks of social, political, and economic exchange between Europe and the Pacific (e.g., see Poole 1997; Edwards 2001; 2003; Specht et al. n.d., Young 1998; Young and Clark 2002; Wright 2003). In what follows I discuss how

---

4 Many of these arguments can also be made for moving images, but in this paper I focus on still photography. See Griffiths (2002) and Grimshaw (2001) for discussions of ethnographic film in the broader context of ethnographic imagery and anthropological practice.
images have mediated exchanges of information and facilitated the development of ideas not only between Cambridge and Malakula, two locations about as geographically removed from one another as it is possible to be, but between academic and popular views of the ‘other,’ and even between generations of anthropologists working in the same academy. My perspective unites two views of photography: one gleaned from academic discourse, and one that I came to appreciate during my own fieldwork in Vanuatu.

Stafford’s Visual Analogy develops some analytic tools with which to start thinking about the special powers of images (including but not restricted to photographs) to forge conceptual networks. She aims “to recuperate the lost link between visual images and concepts, the intuitive ways in which we think simply by visualizing” (1999: 61). The connection between image and concept, she argues, is one of analogy, the process whereby different entities are drawn into a relationship of equivalence. Poole (1997) and Pinney (1997) both demonstrate how this process may be played out specifically with photographic images, showing that photographic practices and products simultaneously embody and connect local diversity and global uniformity. Poole illustrates this with her discussion of the ways in which nineteenth-century Andean stereographs and carte de visites made naturally dissimilar individual objects, from trees and monuments to ethnic groups, equivalent as objects of knowledge through their inscription, circulation, and archiving in a uniform format. This is also one of the net effects of museum collecting, to order diversity through the formation of a collection of objects or images, subservient to museum methods of archiving and classification (see Edwards 2001; Sekula 1989). As the images I discuss here were brought back from the field, eventually to be filed in Haddon’s drawer, they were rendered equivalent, not only to their original index, Malakula, but to one another. An ongoing view of Malakula was thus perpetuated cyclically over time through the production of new images, their inclusion in the archive, the production of new images, and so on.

Within many analyses of anthropological photographs the museum emerges as the archive par excellence, a disciplinary site that orders, arranges, and instigates the creation of ever-expanding collections of image-objects. Edwards’ and Hart’s discussion of a box of photographs in the Pitt Rivers Museum, Oxford (2004), provides a foil for my own analysis of the images in Haddon’s drawer. In foregrounding the productive materiality of the archive, Edwards and Hart highlight the vital impact of the ethnographic museum on present day organization of ideas—the framing, hoarding and re-presentation or re-ordering of images on paper effects the process of anthropology itself, classifying, ordering, and by extension interpreting and understanding (see also Edwards 2001).

The museum archive is increasingly influential outside of the academy. Framed by both exhibitions and community projects, archival photographs
enter into dialogues with people directly related to the images contained within. Examples of this can be found in many contemporary art projects such as the “Imaginary Homecoming” of anthropological photographs of Sami people, re-placed in the landscape by Finnish photographer Jorma Puranen (Edwards 2001: ch. 9), or Shimon Attie’s haunting projections of pre-war images of Jewish life taken from the Berlin archives, onto their, often erased, contemporary sites (Attie 1993). Within the academy, too, photographs have been reactivated by an increasing number of ‘visual repatriation’ projects where anthropologists make the taking back and re-showing of archival images a primary focus of research (e.g. Wright 2004; Bell 2003; Geismar 2005; see figure 4).

My own field-based research into understandings of images and objects in Vanuatu has heightened my awareness of how photographs can facilitate cross-cultural connectivity, forging important “visual economies” (Poole 1997), and I continue to write about the productive uses to which historical images are put in contemporary Vanuatu (see Geismar 2005a; forthcoming; Geismar and Herle n.d.). The Vanuatu Cultural Centre and National Museum (VCC) plays a central role in a creative forging of analogies between archival image and practice in the present day. Briefly stated, one aspect of my work with the VCC has focused on the return to Vanuatu of anthropological photographs and photographs of objects held in museums around the world. In turn the VCC facilitates the movement of these images back into the villages where they were once taken. Within such projects, photographs are used explicitly as conduits into social action, they are re-embedded into practices, becoming, in the present, part of what they once seemed merely to represent from the past. Images are used in preparations for ritual dances, mat-making, painting, story-telling, and so on. These new activities are in turn photographed and filmed, producing new images that enter museum archives with the explicit intention of facilitating the possibility of future activation.

Here, I move back from this dynamic contemporary context, where photographs in archives are drawn into active networks of exchange, performance, and discussion, to the moments in which such images were first produced. At that time too, both photographic images and the practice of photography

---

5 Poole explicitly chooses to use the term “visual economies” instead of “visual cultures” in recognition of the often unequal and colonial political economies that the making and circulation of images are bound up within. She writes, “it is relatively easy to imagine the people of Paris and Peru, for example, participating in the same ‘economy.’ To imagine them as part of a shared ‘culture’ is considerably more difficult. I use the word ‘economy’ . . . with the intention of capturing this sense of how visual images move across national and cultural boundaries” (1997: 8). I acknowledge here that there are frequently imbalances of power and representational authority in the constitution of anthropological images and archives that necessarily affect the substance of any archival project. I explore the resonance of these images, both past and present, for ni-Vanuatu in greater detail elsewhere (Geismar 2005a; Geismar and Herle n.d.).
were able to facilitate the activation of ideas, connecting nostalgia for the permanently receding past to an active struggle to maintain a vision of customary life within a dynamic field of often unequal cross-cultural engagement. The photographs I discuss were made by four different men: John Layard, pioneer of fieldwork methodologies; Bernard Deacon, ‘salvage’ anthropologist; Charles Templeton Crocker, millionaire philanthropist; and Martin Johnson, adventure-seeking motion-picture maker. Together their photographs elicit a composite view of Malakula drawn together by CUMAA between 1915 and 1935, culminating in the formation of the drawer within the Haddon Photographic Collection. By discussing the work of these four photographers, I draw out how an ‘image’ of Malakula was produced within the interplay between photographers, photographed, and photographs, and I highlight, in turn, how important processes of visualization and imagination are to the creation of such dynamic relationships.

**VISUALIZING THE NETWORK: MALAKULA IN CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE IN MALAKULA**

The historical intersections of anthropology and photography have been well documented (e.g., Edwards 1992; Pinney 1992), and it is easy to read the series of images I am about to present as a visual representation of anthropological thought and theory. But I am arguing that during the period these
photographs were brought into the Cambridge Museum, more than just a collection of paper images was being made. The gathering together of photographs as both forms of ethnographic knowledge and indications of travel and research ‘in the field’ played an important role within the formalization of social anthropology as an academic discipline in Cambridge in the first decades of the twentieth century. In a wider sense, it also fuelled the production of an imaginary that extended beyond the academy, eventually moving back to Vanuatu. In this way, I propose to read these images as “visual histories,” rather than as representations of history made elsewhere. Drawing on the work of Christopher Pinney, I suggest that these photographs present not only a history of anthropology and photography in Vanuatu, but contain a history of ideas that have, in turn, been partially made by photographs, photography, and the drawing of visual analogies (see Pinney 2004: 8).

During the period in which the images in Haddon’s drawer were taken, Malakula became an ‘anthropological’ location par excellence, largely due to the wide dissemination of images and objects such as those collected for the Cambridge museum throughout scholarly communities and beyond. The foraged objects and images in the CUMAA acted as visual lures for photographers. For instance, Deacon went into the field with his mind filled with the images taken by Layard and Johnson; Layard and his supervisor, William Halse Rivers Rivers, were initially attracted to Malakula after their encounter with the monumental collections made by Swiss ethnologist Felix Speiser, who travelled through the archipelago in 1910–1912. Reproductions of Speiser’s collection of 1800 objects and 1600 photographs, now in the Basel Museum der Kulturen, were disseminated widely in popular books such as Two Years with the Natives of the New Hebrides (Speiser 1912), as well as in more academic publications.

Within this swirl of images, Haddon himself was something of a nexus; his collections of photographs, may be seen as potent meeting points for contemporary anthropological images and ideas. After his first visit to the Torres Strait Islands in 1888, Haddon gradually moved away from zoology towards anthropology becoming the first lecturer in ethnology at Cambridge and directing much of his work through the Museum. As leader of the 1898 Cambridge Anthropological Expedition to the Torres Strait, Haddon’s developing scientific “study of mankind,” and his early promotion of fieldwork methodologies sensitive to the complex field of social change that both anthropologist and their subjects inhabited, promoted object collection and audio-visual recording as well as scientific observation and experimentation (see Haddon 1898; Herle and Rouse 1998). Such methodologies in turn informed museum principles of collection, display, and conservation, and developed an approach to anthropology that might be termed museological. Indeed, Haddon was active throughout his career in various museums, from the CUMAA to the Horniman Museum in London.
Edwards has noted “Through photography, a perceived cultural essence, an authenticity, was reified . . . it was this view that made photography the salvage tool *par excellence*” (2001: 164–65). From the start, photographs were both tool and metaphor in the delineation of an anthropological practice, predicated on not only representing, but maintaining (albeit not in situ) the past in the present. Haddon was some of the earliest proponents of using visual technologies in the field. His Torres Strait cinematography, of which only four minutes survive, may be counted as some of the earliest ethnographic films, and the Expedition was well equipped with photographic materials. Anthony Wilkin had the role of official photographer, but many other Expedition members also took photographs, including Haddon, who sent back many images to his friends in the islands (see Edwards 1998; Grimshaw 2001: 20; Griffiths 2002: 127–70). Haddon’s exhortation, “Now is the time to record” (1898: xxiii), was an urge to ‘salvage’ via the process of visual (and other) documentation as much as possible of customary activity in the face of its perceived corruption by external forces, before it ceased to exist. In the appendix on photography in the 1912 edition of *Notes and Queries on Anthropology* (the handbook published by the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS) for those working in ‘the field’), Haddon advised not only budding ethnographers, but civil servants, merchants, and missionaries with urgency, “Every photograph should be taken for a definite purpose . . . Always seize the first opportunity for a photograph; in anthropological work, it is often your last. *Never put off til to-morrow what you can do to-day*” (Haddon 1912: 269, 277; see also Urry 1972).

While Haddon was developing fieldwork methodologies and playing an active role in the creation of a professional community of anthropologists in Great Britain, Vanuatu (then known as the New Hebrides) was entering a phase of rapid change and contact with diverse Europeans. The archipelago of eighty-five inhabited islands in the Southwest Pacific was settled by the first Melanesians approximately 3,000 years ago (Gorecki 1996). Europeans ‘discovered’ the islands in 1606 with the arrival of Spanish explorer De Quiros. They were named “The Great Cyclades” by De Bougainville in 1768, and were more comprehensively charted in 1774 by Cook, who renamed them in recognition of the Scottish Hebrides. The first foreign traders came for whales, sea cucumbers, and the trees on sandalwood-rich islands such as Erromango for export to China (Shineberg 1967). At the same time (c. 1863–1904), the labor trade, known as “blackbirding,”

---

moved significant numbers of people back and forth between home, the Queensland sugar plantations, or nickel mines in New Caledonia, amongst other places (Jolly 1994; Shineberg 1999). Alongside plantation owners and labor traders, missionaries also arrived to convert the islanders to Christianity.

From 1906 to 1980 Vanuatu was governed by the Anglo-French Condominium, an enterprise established out of the wrangle for control over trade and colonial domination in the Pacific. This system, frequently also known by the epithet ‘Pacific Pandemonium,’ comprised two commissioners, two residencies, two postal systems, and two languages, and encouraged two broad kinds of Christianity (Anglo-Protestant and Franco-Catholic). The only unity was to be found within a joint court in the capital of Port Vila in which disputes over thorny issues of land ownership were heard (see Miles 1998; Van Trease 1987). The archipelago was divided into districts, each managed by a French and a British District Agent in conjunction with indigenous “assessors” and some newly made “chiefs.”7 Because Vanuatu was never technically a colony but a “region of joint influence,” indigenes (the name ‘ni-Vanuatu’ was adopted at independence in 1980) were denied citizenship to either Great Britain or France, and their national identity remained in a liminal state. It was into this rather haphazard form of nascent national regulation that the photographers I discuss disembarked.

The next largest island after Santo is Malekula . . . well settled by white planters; all in the vicinity of the sea . . . The island possesses some good harbours and bays . . . The interior of the island is not very well known yet, and the inland tribes are somewhat truculent, especially the Big Nambas who inhabit the north-western part. Those on the coast, however, are quite friendly, thanks mainly to the efforts of the missionaries who have been labouring there for years. The continuous traffic of steamers and sailing craft through the islands, and the occasional visits of British and French men-o’-war have also had a pacifying effect. On the island of Atchin, off the north east coast of Malekula, there is a successful mission being conducted by the Seventh Day Adventists. Until recently the island was heathen, and was even unsafe for traders, but now the natives, numbering several hundred, are becoming civilised, and are learning to read and write (Allen 1922: 153–54).

With thirty-five named language groups (Tryon 1996), Malakula is still one of the most diverse islands in the archipelago. Early photographers alighted from their copra trading vessels, private yachts, naval gunboats, and company steamers into an island rich with linguistic and cultural variation, ceremonial and material practices, and inhabited by a motley assortment of missionaries, traders, and colonial administrators. Malakulans were experiencing rapid cultural and economic change, and many were developing a profound nostalgia for past lifestyles that seemed to be swiftly disappearing.

7 Only some parts of the archipelago had indigenous hereditary chiefs; others had political structures of status achieved over a lifetime of ceremonial activity. The colonial administration used the status of chief as a way of creating its own indigenous elite, which did not always coincide with customary structures of authority (see Bolton 1999b: 2).
Examining the work of the photographers who contributed to the contents of Haddon’s drawer can show us how this context was exposed, developed, and filed as ‘anthropological’ information. I will describe the photographic practices of four visitors to Malakula: two anthropologists, and two photographers from non-academic backgrounds whose work was incorporated into the burgeoning discipline. In doing so, I emphasize the ways in which the images they created can be seen as indicative of wider perspectives about the nature of cultural change, contact, and continuity, and how these viewpoints combined—first on Malakula, and subsequently within Haddon’s drawer—to forge some future interests of both anthropologists and ni-Vanuatu.

JOHN WILLOUGHBY LAYARD (1891–1974): PHOTOGRAPHING THE FIELD

In 1914 a young Cambridge student, John Layard, set sail for Australia with his supervisor William Rivers on the SS Euripides. They were part of a larger group of British ethnologists (including Haddon and his daughter Kathleen) traveling to attend a milestone meeting of the BAAS in Australia. The outbreak of war inevitably affected the group of Cambridge anthropologists. Haddon abandoned his plans to take Layard on survey work down the New Guinea coast, and Rivers suggested that the novice anthropologist instead accompany him to the New Hebrides. Rivers was keen to develop his interests in mapping patterns of cultural diffusion in Melanesia (see Langham 1981), intrigued by a recent publication that described a series of “megalithic” ritual complexes in the archipelago (Sperier 1912; see MacClancy 1986).

After consulting with the British Resident Commissioner Merton King in Port Vila, Layard and Rivers travelled to the Small Island of Atchin, a mile from the coast of northeast Malakula. They disembarked into a community suspicious of foreign landings. Several years before, Atchin islanders had clashed violently with the colonial navy after an altercation involving the native wife of a French trader, and they had evicted a second trader just prior to the anthropologists’ arrival. After a week or so of uneasy living, Rivers took advantage of a passing skiff and departed to undertake survey work from the relative comfort of various mission stations throughout the archipelago, leaving Layard to undertake one of the earliest stints of intensive, solitary fieldwork in British anthropology. Layard remained on Atchin for the best part of a year, traveling briefly to the neighboring Small Islands, to Ambae, and to South-West Bay, Malakula. He returned hurriedly to England in 1915 to enlist in the Great War. Already suffering from the exhaustion of fieldwork and the ravages of malaria, Layard’s return precipitated a crisis in his mental and physical health. He was unable to serve in the army or complete his writing up, and spent several years recuperating from what Rivers, by then his doctor as well as supervisor, described as a “severe attack of neurasthenia” (Rivers 1918). Perhaps inspired by Rivers, his earliest mentor and analyst, he gradually abandoned anthropology in favor of
psychology, first training with Homer Lane and eventually with Carl Jung. Living in Berlin in the late 1920s he socialized with Auden and Isherwood, and greatly impressed them with his psychological theories and Malekulan experiences (Firchow 2002). He eventually became a Jungian psychoanalyst with a successful practice in Oxford, and moved further and further away from academic anthropology (Layard n.d.a; 1942b).

In 1914 and 1915, however, Layard collected what has come to be considered one of the most detailed and accurate sets of early ethnological data about customary life in Vanuatu. While almost all of his notes remain unpublished, his monumental *Stone Men of Malekula* (1942a), based on a few weeks of fieldwork on Vao, the island adjacent to Atchin, is testament to the intensity with which he worked. Having studied with Rivers and Haddon in Cambridge in the wake of the 1898 Torres Strait Expedition, Layard was alive to the methodological expectations of the new science of ethnology, and well aware of the prime importance of photography in the collection of ‘scientific’ information. Layard exposed over 400 glass quarter-plates with his box camera during his year on Malakula, evidence of his keen interest in the research potentials of photography. He also made wax cylinder recordings on the latest model Edison Type 2 Phonograph recorder, and gathered a substantial artifact collection for CUMAA.

While taking photographic images followed the formal guidelines in *Notes and Queries* to record customary practices before they could disappear, it also fulfilled another role in the field: facilitating personal as well as scientific encounters between photographer and photographed. A passage from Layard’s fieldwork diary reveals how integrated visual and aural research practices were into his participation in the life of Atchin Islanders:

In the evening at sundown, drums were beaten again, and those assembled at Olep went on to Pwetersüts. All were highly decorated and carried clubs and bows and arrows. . . . We entered through a gap in the women, joined the others, singing the song about Mari. When the song about Mari was finished, Mari presented Malmatun with a pig (I did not see this) as payment and then the songs went on as usual, any man starting a song,

8 Indeed, the dedication in *Stone Men of Malekula* reads: “To the memory of Dr. W.H.R. Rivers who once told me that he would like to have inscribed on his tombstone the words ‘He made ethnology a science.’”

9 Layard’s fieldnotes and unpublished manuscripts, including an almost completed book based on his Atchin fieldwork, are held in the Mandeville Special Collections Library, University of California at San Diego (MSS 84), but his collection of artifacts and photographs are held in the CUMAA. Layard himself donated his collection of objects and the 372 copy-prints for the Haddon Photographic Collection in the museum. His son, Richard Layard, generously donated the original glass-plate negatives to the Museum in 2003. Microfilm copies of Layard’s fieldnotes made by the Mandeville Library, and reprints of the photographs made by the CUMAA, are held in the archive of the Vanuatu Cultural Centre. We see here indications of the international network of images and information forged by museums and archives, and of how Vanuatu has, once again, become a point of convergence for these dispersed collections.
which may or may not be taken up by the others. As an illustration of the way this is done—I had bought my photographs and Meldektsungurei (who was a Metemet—see below—and so not dancing) was very anxious that I should record a certain song. So he called Malteris and one or two others out of the dance and they arranged that at the next opportunity they would strike up this song, saying that Meldektsungurei would raise his hand as a signal to me as soon as the song was well going. All of which they did . . . (Layard n.d.).

The images contained in Haddon’s drawer have been arranged, by unknown hands, according to functional categories in order to make them readily comparable with the other images in the collection. Layard’s photographs have been moved out of their original chronology and organized into sections such as house-building, gardening, fishing, weaving, initiation, and dancing. Only when looking at the original glass-plate negatives does the original order of Layard’s images become transparent, as does what was excised from this classificatory process. Most noticeably, none of the Europeans present during Layard’s stay made their way into Haddon’s drawer. Furthermore, Layard’s personal caption lists indicate how much the photographs in Haddon’s drawer have been re-contextualized—personal names, Atchin language, notes on photographic technique, and ethnographic detail all have been excised in the Cambridge captions, also typed up by Layard.10 It is clear that the copy prints made for the CUMAA were intended to illustrate specific categories and ideas that existed outside of each image, within the Photographic Collection as a whole, and that in this context Layard’s rich ethnographic documentation was dispensable.

The two exceptions to the excision of non-locals from Haddon’s drawer are iconic images of anthropologists—a photograph of Rivers standing with a group of ni-Vanuatu on the veranda steps of a dilapidated mission house (figure 5), and one of Layard himself seated on the ground taking notes (figure 6). If we, as viewers, juxtapose these two images, as one does flicking through Haddon’s drawer, they may be seen to embody a methodological transition, from the mission porch to the ground in front of the native’s home.

Layard’s fieldwork heralded a new period of ethnographic participation. Alone, he was photographer, phonographer, and note-taker, living with a singular intensity amongst local people without the solace of academic conversation. This methodological transition, from the group and survey work practiced by Haddon and Rivers to lone experiential intensity, shifted the

10 There are four different caption lists in the San Diego collection dating from 1914 through to 1963, which vary in detail and emphasis: Layard’s original handwritten list of images taken in the field (1914–1915), a later, undated transcribed typescript, the typed list of photographs sent to Cambridge (c. 1935), and a list of photographs of artefacts prepared for French anthropologist Jean Guiart (1963). The complex interaction between images and text, especially within textual productions such as academic monographs and museum catalogues, plays a vital part in facilitating our understanding of these images.
focus of research and of the camera lens. Following the methodology of the Torres Strait Expedition, Layard photographed as many aspects of customary life in the Small Islands of Atchin, Vao, Wala, and Rano as he could. However, unlike the re-enactment photography of Haddon (see Edwards 2001: ch. 7), or the horizontal mid-field compositions of his contemporary Bronislaw Malinowski (see Young 1998), Layard’s photographs are also testament to an ethnographic presence not always framed by the palpable separation of observer and observed. Layard’s photographs are socially and emotionally immersed—several images are obviously taken in the midst of dances, at the back of moving canoes, inside the crowd. A series of four images that move closer and closer to a group of men are captioned “A quarrel ensued because one of the candidates retaliated when being ceremonially beaten by an initiate. Fighting with paddles/ Discussing matters after the fight/ Closer view/ Still talking.” In the last image, the photographer is standing so close to the disputing youths that the frame is almost entirely filled by a blurred pair of shoulders.
It is also clear that Layard continued to actively use his photographs after his return from the field. He wrote in a letter to Haddon in 1921, “I am still only digging through a shadow of an existence, which consists of a never ending chain of small breakdowns . . . there can be no thought yet of a serious [analysis?] of my notes. I began playing about with my photographs . . .” (Layard 1921). It seems as though his collection of photographs was more than just a method of factual elicitation, it was a direct emotional link between Layard and Malakula, a way of thinking and knowing that could draw him away from mental challenges and lead him back to writing.

Over the years Layard circulated his images broadly in anthropological circles. As well as Haddon, he gave copy-prints to other anthropologists, including Jean Guiart in Paris and Tom Harrisson in London. His personal collection was laid out in an album in a very different manner to Haddon’s drawer, with pages devoted to individual Atchin men and women. A clue to the diverse life of Layard’s images may be seen in a postcard held in the CUMAA archive, made from an image of an Atchin youth, Malsibini, feeding his sacrificial pig, mounted and inscribed Greetings from John and Doris Layard (figure 7). The pencil annotations by an anonymous hand on
the grey board—"Malekula—pig with deformed tusks"—show how the image was received informally, and subsequently filed as ethnographic information, exposing the ways in which museum archives mediate the personal and academic engagements facilitated by fieldwork photographs.

Situating the rest of Layard’s images within the intimate context of his own anthropological presence adds some subtle nuances to his primary focus on customary life in the Small Islands. The bulk of Layard’s photographs held in Haddon’s drawer are concerned with the events comprising the complex “megalithic” ritual ceremonies of male status acquisition (known as Maki) that dominated men’s lives during Layard’s stay. Since these ceremonies took place over the course of a generation, Layard was only able to document a small fraction of activity. He witnessed the initiations of younger boys, and photographed their rites of passage into manhood alongside attendant dances, food preparations, drum raisings, and canoe voyages. He journeyed with Atchin islanders to the neighboring Small Islands to join in equivalent ceremonies, taking photographs at every juncture, and travelled with his

Figure 7 Layard’s caption for the copy of this image in Haddon’s drawer is, “Youth named Mal-sibini feeding a re-entrant-tusker he was about to sacrifice during the course of his initiation rite on Atchin.” This card, kept in an archive box photographic collection has been inscribed by Layard and an unknown curatorial hand (CUMAA P.48620.ACH2).
camera as far as Ambae (then known as Oba or Leper’s Isle), where he voyaged with young candidates to buy red mats for their “initiation into sex” (Layard 1942a: 523–29).

Layard’s interest in photographing aspects of local life perceived to be authentic, or pre-colonial, in the face of rapid cultural change was not only precipitated by the agenda of ‘salvage anthropology’ but also reflected native concerns. For example, mining the customary past was an explicit agenda of Layard’s main field assistants Ma-Taru (or Mal-Taru) on Vao, pictured with Layard above, and Mari on Atchin. Layard wrote in the preface to *Stone Men of Malekula*: “I had the good fortune to meet immediately with a first-class informant, Ma-taru, a man in the prime of life, who had once been a member of a Presbyterian Mission school but had renounced Christianity and had returned to Vao in order to rebuild the fortunes of his family by an intensive prosecution of megalithic ritual” (1942a: xix). Mari had experienced a similar disillusionment with plantation work and, having lost all his money, returned to Atchin intent on reinvigorating the ceremonial life of his decimated village. The photographic preservation of rapidly changing practice in this context was therefore more than just an anthropological exercise. For some local people, a return to tradition after experiencing the effects of colonial economic, political, and social life, was fast becoming a mode of resistance—a reflection upon and galvanization of the past in the face of rapid cultural change. This agenda, which is continued into the present day through the work of the VCC, connects anthropologists to ni-Vanuatu. Both use the taking and circulating of photographs as a method of drawing analogies between the past and the present.

BERNARD DEACON (1903–1927): PHOTOGRAPHY AND FRUSTRATION

Stimulated by the rich customary life he had seen in Layard’s images, on 1 October 1926, Arthur Bernard Deacon, Anthony Wilkin Scholar and Haddon’s protégé, also set sail for Malakula (figure 8). Following Layard’s advice he was headed for South-West Bay, armed with the fieldnotes Layard had made during a short visit there (eventually published in Layard 1928). The existing cursory notes and publications, such as those by missionary Rev. T. Watt-Leggatt (1906), suggested that the region was rich in megalithic rites similar to the ceremonial practices that Layard had documented in the Small Islands. Upon his arrival, Deacon perceived the area to be in a severe state of cultural decline. Mortality rates had vastly increased, due in part to malaria and in part to the introduction of diseases such as influenza by missionaries and colonists (see Durrad 1922). Many locals had converted to Christianity, or seemed obsessed with making money. Deacon wrote in an early letter to

---

11 The scholarship was set up in memory of Anthony Wilkin, a member of the 1898 Torres Strait Expedition.
Haddon: “Everyone has been led away by the glitter of civilization—rifles, gin, rum, watches, electric torches, condensed milk, tinned meat (both consumed in considerable quantities); the price of cotton, the doings of traders, these are becoming more and more the principle interests of the natives” (quoted in Haddon 1934: xxi).

This and other letters recounting his field experiences prompted Camilla Wedgwood, another of Haddon students, to write to Deacon in the field: “It must be disheartening to find the people so terribly ‘civilized,’ but the material you have got seems to be amazing” (Wedgwood 1926). Deacon gloomily concluded that he was documenting a “vanishing people.” His personal correspondence increasingly laments the dissolution of traditional

---

12 There is no documentation for this image in Cambridge, apart from the cited caption, which was typed on a catalogue card when the image was mounted to go into the New Hebrides drawer of the Haddon Collection in 1935. There is however, an empty envelope of the same dimensions in the archives of the Royal Anthropological Institute upon which is typed: “copy of a snapshot of Deacon taken by Mr. Plowman, a planter, in Malekula about a week before the death of the former in 1927. The original is in the possession of Deacon’s mother. Photograph given to Mr. G. B. Milner in Samoa by Mr. Plowman. 27/04/56” (Deacon MS 91, RAI photo archive). It seems very possible to me that this refers to the image in Cambridge. When Deacon died, Haddon became executor of his academic estate. After gathering together all of Deacon’s field material and collection of artefacts, Haddon handed over the bulk of the field notes to Camilla Wedgwood, whom he and Radcliffe-Brown had chosen to edit Deacon’s work for publication. Malekula: A Vanishing People in the New Hebrides (Deacon 1934) took several years to prepare. Afterward, Wedgwood gave her own material and Deacon’s original notes to the Royal Anthropological Institute.
life: “Everything has gone, or is going, in the New Hebrides. I’m just getting what I can before it goes altogether” (Deacon 1927).

With a keen artistic eye, visual practice was evidently important to Deacon during his fieldwork. From an equipment and things-to-do list he drew up before going into the field, and from a letter he wrote to Haddon after supply shopping in London, we learn that Deacon took a quarter plate Graphlex camera, “focal plane shutter, double extension, with films, postcard size,” and a Vest Pocket Kodak, “for odd work” to Malakula (Deacon 1925b). At the top of the list is photographic equipment—developing tank, fixing dishes, and acid fixing salts—plus basic notes about field development: “Use acid fixing salts not hypo . . . note difficulty about water—must get up early if want it cold” (Deacon 1925a). Photography was obviously a priority in terms of equipment and expenditure, beating quinine, aspirin, opium pills, and a “flannel for wrapping around stomach” to the top of the supply list, the admonishment to “get in touch with photographic expert” superseding one that he “must get a mummy,” presumably out of the collections grant given to him by Haddon for the CUMAA (Deacon 1925a).

On 12 March 1927, after a year of fieldwork and one week before he was due to leave Malakula to take up a position at Sydney University, Deacon died of blackwater fever in the house of missionaries Mr. and Mrs. Boyd. Wedgwood was chosen by Haddon to edit Deacon’s scattered and often undated fieldnotes into the manuscript *Malekula: A Vanishing People in the New Hebrides* (1934). The atmosphere of cultural dissolution and decay that Deacon repeatedly documented did not leave his editor unaffected (see Wetherell and Carr-Gregg 1990). She wrote to Haddon, in the midst of piles of papers: “I wish to goodness the wretched thing were finished. The more I think of it the more gloomy I become about it. The whole thing is so dead—it seems impossible to make the people and their culture seem alive, for there is absolutely no information about their daily life, the everyday behaviour of one individual to another . . . I feel all the while as though I was looking at a photograph which is out of focus” (Wedgwood 1931).

Wedgwood’s photographic metaphor is apt in the light of how Deacon discussed his own work. The salvage paradigm left him ill equipped to understand the predicament of rapid cultural change he witnessed in southern Malakula. Deacon believed he could not “see” any of the vibrant traditional culture that he had arrived on the island determined to document. In a letter to his Cambridge tutor, anthropologist W. E. Armstrong, he wrote: “I feel bitterly envious of Layard. He could follow a whole ceremony, where I have to try and piece the thing together from descriptions, never sure that I am visualising correctly” (Deacon 1926, my emphasis). Deacon felt that the cultural decline in southern Malakula forced him into a descriptive rather than visual domain, assembling information from conversation rather than observation: “I have been here four months and not a single thing has taken
place except funerals of which there have been about a dozen” (ibid., my emphasis).

Born in Russia, Deacon was a romantic, imbued with the sensibilities of Proust and Chekhov, interested in the fusion of arts and sciences. He was equally interested in music and natural science, studying French, Russian, and Physics for his undergraduate degree before taking the diploma in anthropology at Cambridge. His letters and notes from the field agonize repeatedly over the role, established by Rivers and Haddon, of anthropology as a “natural science,” or as a subject reliant upon verifiable objective data (see Gardiner 1987). His agenda at the outset of fieldwork was to follow the path set by Rivers and develop a “scientific” model of cultural diffusion in the Pacific, but he over time he increasingly came to struggle with the broad comparative framework that Rivers had developed in *History of Melanesian Society* (1914), without detailed local, particularly linguistic, knowledge to flesh out his analysis of the more abstract relationships between culture areas. Deacon wrote to his friend, Margaret Gardiner, from the field, that he desired “to evolve (as Rivers did) a general scheme for W. Pacific cultures” but was unable to do this from his village vantage point:

... I realize more and more that I have only the vaguest idea of what is meant by ‘sociology’ and ‘social psychology’ [Rivers’ métier]—at least as practical sciences in which research is to be done. It is so different in physics and chemistry—there you have a vast structure of really beautiful theory, experimentally verified in enormous numbers of ways, and as undoubtedly true, I suppose, as anything of the kind one can think of—so research has a great theoretical searchlight, there is coherence and direction. Here (in ethnology) it is all a mess—I suspect most ethnologists are bad historians, or bad psychologists, or bad romanticists (Gardiner 1987: 44–45).

From the outset, Deacon struggled in matching up anthropological theory and expectation to Malakulan reality as he perceived it. If Layard’s photographs allow us to witness the incorporation of early scientific anthropological methodologies and attitudes into sustained, intimate fieldwork, Deacon’s images demonstrate that within this process, the practice of photography could become a domain of struggle, even crisis, between the ethnographer’s eye and his imagination, between theory and practice. There is an obvious disjuncture between Deacon’s camera’s lens and his ambivalent mind’s eye. Looking at the images Deacon exposed, in the context of his struggle to “see” during his fieldwork, one perceives the deep-seated frustration Deacon held with the model of anthropology he had entered the field with—salvage was all very well but what if there seemed to be nothing left to save?

Deacon’s photographs show how he attempted to use photography to engage with the canon of anthropological methods that had been made available to him through his training at Cambridge. At the same time, they embody some of the insecurities and slippages that even then permeated such
methodologies, and which resulted directly from the ethnographer’s personal experience in the field. Haddon’s drawer holds seventy-one images taken by Deacon. Most of them were used as plates in Deacon (1934). Flipping through the cards in the drawer, the first prints one encounters follow the order of the plates in the monograph, ‘establishment shots,’ showing the bay and the mountains, the physical environment within which fieldwork took place.

These give way to a series of ‘physical anthropology’ head shots, people face forwards and in profile, some against white backing sheets, others against tree trunks (cf. Edwards 2001: ch. 6). In this we can see that Deacon follows Haddon’s instructions in the 1912 Notes and Queries almost to the letter (the next edition was in preparation whilst Deacon was in the field):

A certain number of typical individuals should always be taken as large as possible, full face and exact side view; the lens should be on a level with the face, and the eyes of the subject should be directed to a mark fixed at their own height from the ground, or to the horizon . . . As a background, a soft, fine-grained, neutral-tinted screen may be used, sufficiently light in colour to contrast well with yellow and brown skins. Choose a site where the light is as strong as possible for as long as possible every day. A rough studio may be arranged for a prolonged stay. Provide a few sheets of white paper or cardboard to use as reflectors, to modify the shadows. It is necessary to support the head of the sitter in some way if slow plates are used or if the photograph is taken in the shade (Haddon 1912: 269–70).

Deacon wrote to Haddon before leaving for the field that he intended to photograph both “average types” and “extremes” and to plot their measurements, “as an alternative to taking a complete series of photographs of everyone I measure” (Deacon 1925b). As well as measuring living people, Deacon, following Haddon’s instructions, also actively collected skulls. In one of his most chilling anecdotes, Deacon wrote to Gardiner describing some local attitudes to his collection of remnants of the dead: “I’ve got to collect skulls for Haddon: a man said to me one day ‘soon you (the white man) will be able to come and collect all our skulls: we wont bother you.’ There is an utterly weary irony about them—you cannot imagine how suicidal the gloom of working in it sometimes becomes” (Gardiner 1987: 34).

Whilst Deacon’s photographic collection of racial information seems at first glance to fit into contemporary paradigms of physical anthropology, the ways in which he framed his images (giving us some clues as to the experiences that he had in producing them) may be seen to expose a far more ambivalent state of affairs. For his cranial analyses, Deacon chooses as his first subject “the last survivor” of Melpmes village—his anthropometric image also becoming a sympathetic social commentary and an attempted form of salvage (figure 9). His caption for the image reflects his reluctance to view his subjects as racial stereotypes; he is evidently distressed at the demise of a local community.
Deacon’s photographic practice was evidently held in a tension between the methodological expectations of scientific anthropology, the salvage potentials of field photography, and his personal perceptions of cultural disintegration and annihilation. His images straddle all of these ethnographic imaginations. Not surprisingly, he focused his camera increasingly into the domain of mortuary ritual, paying attention to the mortuary elements of secret male ceremonies such as the *Nalawan*, and the production of funeral effigies known as *Rambaramp*, one of which he collected for the Cambridge museum (fulfilling his goal to “get a mummy”). In figure 10, a Malakulan man, posing in secret society costume for the camera, reflects the rigid pose of *Rambaramp* effigies as they were displayed in both villages and in museums. Deacon visited the Australian Museum on his way out to Malakula and sketched the *Rambaramp* in their collection (figure 11). During fieldwork he was able to annotate the sketches with ethnographic information (figure 12). The formal connections between these three kinds of image, each of which formed an intrinsic part of Deacon’s research, indicate the complicity of images in

---

In a further comment, Deacon wrote, “Melpmes has also fallen into ruin and there are only three survivors of the clan, one of these is son of the old head sorcerer and (as this office descends in the male line) initiated into much of his father’s knowledge although he never finished the course. Considering that Melpmes has not existed for the last 20 years (the mission has been here for 31 years), it is remarkable that this particular man should have survived” (Deacon n.d.). By an ironic twist of fate, local islanders attribute Deacon’s death to an unauthorised visit to this tabu site, which he visited in order to take photographs.
forging conceptual connections, and highlights the joint migration of both image and ideas from Vanuatu to Cambridge. In this case the networks of circulating objects and images between museums in Cambridge and Melbourne, and between England, Vanuatu, and Australia, provided an image-based framework for Deacon to interpret the complex ritual life in South-West Bay.

The publication of Deacon’s personal correspondence (Gardiner 1987) has led some to promote him as a precursor of postmodern reflexive anthropology (e.g., Clifford 1997). However, Deacon’s narration of doubt and insecurity obscures some of his more confident anthropological moments. In addition to doubt and gloom, he experienced moments of intense elation and satisfaction with his work, which he also externalized through visual production. During fieldwork, as well as taking photographs, Deacon sketched, painted, and did rubbings of the carved faces of slit-drums on the reverse of sheets of packing paper. His interests, both visual and anthropological, were most prominently captivated by the geometric sand drawings that he documented in great detail in fieldnotes and drawings, now housed in the archives of the Royal Anthropological Institute, London. Deacon drew and schematized the sand drawings many times, and photographed them drawn on both sand and blackboard (figure 13). He clearly felt that their documentation was one of his most important fieldwork achievements (see Gardiner 1987:44; Deacon and Wedgwood 1934). The detailed and permanent inscription of sand drawings made by Deacon’s own visual practices feeds into a more global
FIGURE 11 Photograph in Haddon’s New Hebrides drawer captioned “Rambaramp in the National Mus. of Victoria, Melbourne, No. 3347, from Port Sandwich Malekula, purchased from Lieutenant W. J. Colquhoun R. N. of H. M. S. Royalist in 1890.” The image is reproduced, with another figure, in Deacon (1934: pl. XX) with the caption: “Two rambaramp in the National Museum of Victoria, Melbourne. We owe these photographs to the courtesy of Mr D. Mahony, the Director of the Museum” (CUMAA P.3978.ACH1).
affirmation of these ephemeral creations. Sand drawings still flourish in Vanuatu, and UNESCO has recently accredited them as “intangible cultural heritage” (see Zagala 2004).

Looking at Deacon’s photographs with hindsight, we can see that his visual productivity, in particular that of photography, resulted from a meeting of the often conflicting emotions of the anthropologist whose sense of rapid,
destructive cultural change ran alongside the documentation of continually regenerating customary practices. Photographs here are not only reflections of this complicated context, they are a mode of representational practice that, like sand drawing, was designed to fit within a dynamic and changing environment. Despite the canonical rhetoric that surrounded and contributed to their constitution, and Deacon’s own troubles in articulating it, his images are emotional encapsulations of intense moments of change and well as documentations of more continuous traditions, illuminated perfectly by the presence of the ethnographer’s shadow alongside the ephemeral sand drawing he is recording for posterity.

The photographic work of Layard and Deacon highlights some of the ways in which the early practice of anthropology was reliant upon both the collection of visual material and the development of a visual sensibility during fieldwork, and it also exposes how the anthropologists’ imaginative understandings of Malakula were, in part, constituted by these visual practices. Whilst the trigger for such visualization was an interest in capturing, documenting, even salvaging traditional practice in the context of rapid cultural change and development, both sets of images provide us with a more nuanced picture of life in Malakula. They expose the involved presence of the ethnographer and highlight their ambivalences regarding the rate of cultural change and the incursions of ‘modernity’ into ‘tradition.’
In the period during which Layard and Deacon worked, other kinds of photographers were also visiting Malakula, and their pictures engaged the imaginations of the anthropologists entering into Haddon’s domain. Two of the photographers (or to be more precise, producers of photographic images) whose work built up an image of Malakula in the New Hebrides drawer created their photographs from a very different set of assumptions, expectations, and interpretive backgrounds. Whilst their professional lives set them apart from anthropologists, the fact that all of these photographs are in the same drawer, within an anthropology museum renowned for the development of fieldwork methodologies and for fostering the nascent discipline of social anthropology in Great Britain, demonstrates how images are able to cross-cut discursive boundaries, and mould and shape the meanings that emerged from them. For example, Deacon took a packet of Martin Johnson’s images into the field, and several were used as plates in his posthumous monograph. Haddon entrusted Charles Templeton Crocker to collect ‘ethnographic’ information (sketches, photographs, and notes) on canoes as he cruised through the Pacific. The vast collection of lantern slides Templeton Crocker created and donated to several museums, including Cambridge, were also used extensively as teaching tools. Such images, exemplified by the ones in Haddon’s drawer, are themselves complicit in overriding discursive (and academic) boundaries in the constitution of ‘anthropological’ information. They demonstrate the complex field that the network of reproducible images engendered for the field of anthropology, linking diverse places, people, and social and political relationships within its ideologies and practices.

TEMPLETON CROCKER (1884–1948): PHOTOGRAPHY AS PHILANTHROPY

As his profession one day in 1910, C. Templeton Crocker simply replied “millionaire.” He thought the response was more than adequate.

———Svanevik and Burgett (2002)

Between 1932 and 1938, San Francisco millionaire, opera lover, and extravagant socialite Charles Templeton Crocker funded six expeditions to the Pacific on his two-mast schooner, the Zaca. Working under the umbrella of the California Academy of Sciences, he collaborated with a number of respected ethnological museums, including the Field Museum in Chicago, the American Museum of Natural History in New York, the Bishop Museum in Honolulu, and CUMAA. These museums were pleased to take advantage of the well-financed expedition, and made requests for ethnographic material, which in turn legitimated the voyage as a ‘scientific’ endeavor. Templeton Crocker made collections, took photographs, and gathered all manner of ethnographic information, alongside his other activity of pleasure cruising—fishing, diving, exploring, and receiving the odd luxurious hamper from the London grocers Fortnum and Mason, along the way. Accompanied on his many voyages by
a diverse number of botanists, ethnologists, and marine biologists, a consistent member of the crew was Japanese-American photographer and artist Toshio Asaeda, who is presumed to have taken all of the photographs on the expeditions. Neither Templeton Crocker’s more academic pursuits nor Asaeda’s name are mentioned in *The Cruise of the Zaca* (Templeton Crocker 1933) that described the Western Pacific expedition of 1932–1933. During this voyage they sailed to Malakula, traveling from Bushman’s Bay to the island of Atchin, and journeyed into the interior populated by the Big Nambas (see below). Several of the images used in this book are in Haddon’s drawer.

Despite being exposed with Asaeda behind the lens, these images must also be seen as Templeton Crocker’s creations and commissions. They were donated to the museum in the form of prints and lantern slides, along with a small collection of artifacts, notes, drawings, and photographs of canoe styles. The latter were specially requested by Haddon who was compiling an overview of canoes in Melanesia (see Haddon and Hornell 1975[1936]). The Museum’s annual report of 1933 reports that hundreds of photographs, fifty lantern slides, and two reels of films of natives and material culture of the Pacific were donated by Templeton Crocker. Seventy-one photographs from this donation are in Haddon’s drawer, over half of them taken on Malakula.

In notable contrast to the photographs by Deacon and Layard, all of which demonstrate a marked familiarity, even intimacy, with their subjects, Templeton Crocker’s images mark out a very different set of cultural encounters. While Templeton Crocker’s own narrative and image captions conform more to popular stereotypes of exotic primitives, the images themselves may be seen to present a more contemporary form of encounter between foreigner and local. They do not excise the presence of the white man (present only as a shadow in Deacon’s photographs), and ni-Vanuatu are snapped carrying rifles, and wearing non-indigenous clothing—shorts, shirts, trousers, and the occasional ‘Mother Hubbard’ dress. Many of Templeton Crocker’s images contain figures cut off by the frame of the photograph, continually referencing activities going on around the photographer and photographed (figure 14). Photographs were frequently taken on the beach, the landing point for traders and settling places for missionaries, and show the small cutter that the crew of the *Zaca* would have alighted from. This

---

14 The ‘scientific’ crew of the Zaca included at different times: Toshio Asaeda (artist and photographer), John Hynes (ship’s surgeon), Sylvester M. Lambert of the Western Pacific Health Service, Gordon MacGregor (ethnologist from the Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Malachai (native medical practitioner from Suva, Fiji), Norton Stewart (naturalist, from Santa Barbara, California), Gordon White (British Solomon Islands Protectorate Health Department), and Maurice Willows (entomological collector). Asaeda also made a film of the journey, *The Templeton Crocker Expedition* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1933), and during the same voyage Rene Gasse made the film *People and Dances of Oceania*, see Root (1987).
location and the attendant captions for the images, with their frequent mention of cannibals, show us a very different type of ‘field’ to that of Deacon and Layard. Figure 15 shows us such a moment of encounter—a man from northeast Malakula holding his rifle calmly sits on a beach among a group of young boys (other photographs show the cutter he is gazing at). Templeton Crocker captions this image in his book with a comment about the man’s cannibal history, and his particular penchant for eating youths. In this instance the disjuncture between text and image is almost palpable. An equitable image of encounter is framed by within popular expectations about the primitive Pacific, aimed at the readers of his rollicking journal. The picture is captioned less sensationally in Haddon’s drawer—whilst they may be presented as cannibals to the museum, curatorial authority notes that they are “really Big Nambas” and co-opts them into a numerical sequence, presumably referring to other images within Templeton Crocker’s donation.

Despite the tensions raised between the image of contemporary encounter and its primitivist commentary, photographs such as these by Templeton Crocker most certainly contributed to the development of Malakula as a visual lure for anthropologists—Templeton Crocker’s lantern slides were used by Haddon as a teaching aid in courses specially designed for colonial
administrators, and would have also formed part of the visual canon for the small but growing number of anthropologists who were developing a specialty in the ethnology of Vanuatu. From the perspective of local Malakulans, these images certainly highlight the fusion of local and foreign that determined many of their lives at that time, informed outsider’s attitudes towards them, and conditioned their behavior when they alighted from their vessels—a precursor of the sort of tourism that culminated in an NBC television season of “Survivor: Vanuatu” in Autumn 2004, in which teams of young Americans were dropped into ‘the middle of nowhere’ where they were welcomed by half-naked tribal dancers and had to “survive” away from “civilization,” or face the cannibal pot (see Lindstrom 2005).

The idea of ‘otherness’ in which both difference and recognition are mutually constituted is one that is sharply assisted by visual images. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the photographic practice of Martin Johnson. Whilst there are only four images taken by Martin Johnson in Haddon’s drawer, they best encapsulate some ways in which photographic images facilitated the formulation of visual analogies in networks broad enough to incorporate Malakula as well as Cambridge.

FIGURE 15 This image is reproduced in Templeton Crocker (1933: 115) with the caption: “A Cannibal of the Nivambat Tribe who had killed and eaten a youth a short time previously.” The image’s caption in Haddon’s drawer reads “Cannibals. Nivambat tribe. Malekula. New Hebrides. Slide Nos. 43–49. These are really Big Nambas, from Tinomlit & Tanmarer villages, of series 525–577” (CUMAA P.3932.ACH1).
MARTIN JOHNSON (1884–1937): SHOWING IMAGES OF THE ‘EXOTIC’ TO THE ‘OTHERS’

Martin and Osa Johnson were professional explorers, photographers, and filmmakers who travelled the world taking photos, making motion pictures, and performing at public lectures. Martin Johnson first visited the Pacific in 1907, spending two years as boat-hand and cook with Jack and Charmian London on board the Snark. He returned to his native Kansas in 1909 with films, photographs, objects, and stories and began his new career as a travel lecturer. Key to his popularity were the sensational images he presented of primitive tribes, some of which he claimed were still practicing cannibals. Meeting and marrying Osa in 1910, they travelled North America presenting their lecture program “Martin E. Johnson’s Travelogues” and working vaudeville seasons, sharing bills with, among others, W. C. Fields (Froehlich 1997: 3). In 1917 they raised funds for another Pacific voyage, and headed straight to Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands, where they had heard that the last remaining cannibal tribes were most easily found (see O. Johnson 1944, 1989). Their ambition was to catch on celluloid nitrate a “human feast”—the icing on the cake of their vaudeville act. During this trip they briefly visited and filmed the Big Nambas of the Northern interior of Malakula, according to Martin Johnson’s account escaping only in the nick of time from the pot themselves (1922). By the time they were “rescued” by a British gunboat, they had enough material for the film Cannibals of the South Seas/Captured by Cannibals (1918).

In 1919 they returned to Malakula. Basing themselves on the Small Island of Vao (four years after Layard’s departure) at the Catholic mission with Father Prin, they traveled into the interior with local traders and an armed ni-Vanuatu escort. During this stay, they returned to the Big Nambas region where they re-encountered their fierce chief, Nagapate, and showed the film they had made two years before. Johnson’s description of this endures as a great moment of photographic encounter. He describes setting up his camera and screen in the midst of the bush and enticing Malakulans to come to a viewing:

I showed them a picture of Osa and me as we left the Astor Hotel in New York. Then I showed them the crazy thousands that had crowded New York streets on Armistice Day. I followed this picture with glimpses of Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Honolulu, Tokyo, and Sydney. Nagapate told me afterward that he had not known there were so many white people in all the world and asked me if the island I came from was much larger than Malekula. I showed in quick succession, steamers, racing automobiles, airplanes, elephants, ostriches, giraffes. The savages were silent; they could not comprehend these things. So I brought them nearer home, with pictures taken on Vao, Santo, and other islands of the New Hebrides.

Now it was time for the great scene. I instructed Paul in turning the crank of the projector and put Stephens and Perrole in charge of the radium flares. I myself took my
stand behind my camera, which was trained on the audience. A hundred feet of titles—then Nagapate’s face appeared suddenly on the screen. A great roar of “Nagapate” went up. At that instant the radium lights flashed on, and I, at my camera, ground out the picture of the cannibals at the “movies.” True, about two-thirds of the audience, terrified by the flares, made precipitately for the bush. But Nagapate and the savages around him sat pat and registered fear and amazement for my camera. In about two minutes the flares burned out. Then we coaxed back to their places the savages that had fled. I started the reel all over and ran it to the end amid an uproar that made it impossible for me to make myself heard when I wanted to speak to Osa. Practically every savage pictured on the screen was in the audience . . . As each man appeared, they called out his name and laughed and shouted with joy. Among the figures that came and went on the screen was that of a man who had been dead a year. The natives were awe-struck. My magic could bring back the dead! (1922: 94–99).

This time, the Johnson’s felt their trip had been successful, and they entertained their audiences for many nights with their tale of discovering an abandoned cannibal feast at a Malakulan village.

Nagapate is snapped in two of the four images held in Haddon’s drawer, all of them prints from Johnson’s book *Cannibal Land: Adventures with a Camera in the New Hebrides* (Johnson 1922; see figure 16). All of Johnson’s images in Haddon’s drawer are portraits, emphasizing the personal connections he developed during the process of taking images. Johnson was a
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**Figure 16**  Photo by Martin Johnson in Haddon’s Drawer. Big Nambas, “Nagapate among the devil-devils.” The caption is taken from *Cannibal Land* and has passed into the museum card catalogue. Nagapate is a big nambas chief of the interior, seen here posing with drums from the Small Island of Atchin (Big Nambas P.3960.ACH1).
pioneer in image-taking who perfected techniques not only of developing and protecting stock and negatives in the field, but in engaging the locals on their own terms: “I gave presents of tobacco for every picture I made. I must have paid out several dollars’ worth of tobacco each day. Ten years earlier, when I was on the Snark with Jack London, trade tobacco made from the stalks and refuse from the Virginia tobacco factories had cost less than a cent a stick. The supply I had with me in Malekula had cost almost four cents a stick. Thus the high cost of living makes itself felt even in the South Seas. Tinned foods, cartridges, gasoline, mirrors, knives, and calico also have increased in price enormously since the war” (1922: 85).

The success Johnson had in creating images did not go unrecognized in anthropological circles: his real magic was the ability to use his photographic images to connect contexts, to bring New York City to Malekula, Malekula to Cambridge. The agenda of Johnson’s photographs was overtly populist, and like Templeton Crocker’s images primitivist and exoticizing, but nonetheless Cambridge anthropologists managed to also successfully appropriate them. Several of Johnson’s other images were used in Deacon’s posthumous monograph, not only because they filled visual gaps but also because of their popular visual appeal. Deacon had certainly been aware of Johnson’s work before he left for Malakula. He wrote to Haddon before his departure: “I am sending you the prospectus of a Malekulan film shortly to be ‘released,’ Some of it is amusing reading. The Unity Film Co. are going to let me have some of the photos (S. Malekula) to take out” (Deacon 1925b). Later from the field he wrote to Margaret Gardiner: “A cutter has just come in, which is going up to Big Nambas territory on Monday. I am going to move up there, it is an extreme piece of luck, they are the only real ‘cannibals’ left—though not in the cinema sense of Martin Johnstone [sic]. (He filmed them a couple of years ago but the whole thing was a pack of lies—I think it was shown in London.)” (in Gardiner 1987: 47).

Evidently, despite Deacon’s judgment that the film was “a pack of lies,” the images were good enough for him to take them into the field with him, and to entice him to the Big Nambas region, drawn by Johnson’s reiteration of the savage reputation of the isolated “cannibal” inhabitants—a cross-over interest, which shows us how some of the more discursive distinctions between ‘popular’ and ‘academic’ anthropology cohabited within the same imaginary. Deacon was unsuccessful in his attempts to spend a serious length of time with the notorious Big Nambas, being actively discouraged by the British Resident Commissioner in Port Vila. Martin Johnson’s images were used as analogical substitutes for the real thing in Deacon’s monograph, as illustration for information discussed, but not recorded. In turn, these images also facilitated a number of dialogues, between Johnson and Nagapate on the one hand, and popular and academic anthropology on the other. In figure 17, two of Johnson’s informants, including Nagapate, are photographed sitting on the
ground looking up at the photographer. The caption to this plate in Deacon’s monograph describes a list of the material culture they are posing with. The photograph places people and museum objects into an analogous relationship, drawn together by the shared gaze of photographer and anthropologist, and subsuming a multiplicity of perspectives and contexts within one mediated zone of encounter.

In more recent years, Johnson’s images have been re-placed (in a similar fashion to the ways in which Deacon’s documentation of sand-drawings have been used), in contemporary Vanuatu, by those working within the Vanuatu Cultural Centre to visually retrace the customary past. Kirk Huffman, curator of the VCC from 1976–1989, took back Johnson’s images to Malakula on his first visit in 1972. He wrote back to Peter Gattercole, his supervisor at the CUMAA: “Do you remember me telling you about one of Martin Johnson’s’ photographs of some Big Nambas in front of some very non-looking Big Nambas slit drums [Figure 16]? I was right, the photo (also published as Big Nambas in Harrisson’s Savage Civilisation) was taken on Atchin—I’ve found out where and from what spot it was taken . . . the famous Johnson photo, one of his most widely published, was taken I’m now sure, at Olep amal. . . . In the bush I’ve even found the rotting remains

FIGURE 17 This image by Martin Johnson is uncaptioned in the Haddon Photographic Collection. It is reproduced in Deacon 1934: pl. X: A, captioned: “Big Nambas men, Atree and Nagapate, the chief, who is wearing the bark belt, the voluminous nambas (pp. 10, 14, 267), a nose-stick and two deformed boar’s tusk armlets” (CUMAA P.70869.ACH1).
(the whole place is overgrown) of the actual slit drums in the photo” (Huffman 1973).

The boundaries between popular and academic anthropology, seemingly so clear to ethnographers such as Bernard Deacon, are in reality much more blurred. Johnson’s images, after circulating widely in a variety of popular and academic publication, have become ‘evidence’ in contemporary Vanuatu in the same way that Layard’s have—as newly activated embodiments of the past in the present. However, this re-valued objectivity is understood to have emerged out of a very specific set of social and political encounters, equally envisioned within the same images. In the context of Haddon’s drawer, both Johnson and Templeton Crocker contributed significantly to the constitution of (visual) knowledge of Malakula in Cambridge, and their images interplay with those taken by more ‘academic’ anthropologists. Indeed, placing these images side-by-side in museum storage emphasizes some of the slippages between ‘anthropological’ and ‘popular’ attitudes at the time, and the ability of both image and imagination to transcend these divides.

CONCLUSION—INDIGENOUS IMAGINATIONS

Huffman’s work in the 1970s and 1980s precipitated an efflorescence of local interest in historic photographs in Vanuatu. Since then, such images have been productively used by the VCC, often with an explicit agenda of “cultural reawakening or revival” (Huffman 1997: 2; 1996a; Sam [Kapere] 1996). Archival material is frequently a starting point for anthropological research projects that, following the Vanuatu National Cultural Research Policy, must be organized collaboratively between foreign and indigenous researchers. Within these projects, archival photographs are frequently drawn into analogous relationships with contemporary social practices. Photographs, and other collected artifacts, thus not only circulate in broad networks, they are often a trigger for such networks to be built. Luring anthropologists back to Vanuatu and ni-Vanuatu to Port Vila and beyond, and moving back and forth between museum and village, photographs remain active participants in moments of dynamic cultural development and interconnection.

For example, in the 1980s several men from Lamap village in southern Malakula embarked on a research project to reclaim and revivify their customary practices, primarily ceremonies of male initiation. Because the entire region had converted to Christianity over 100 years before, many of these ceremonies had never been practiced in living memory. Building on oral histories passed down from generation to generation, and working closely with the VCC, villagers tracked down images of historic objects collected in the region as well as other photographs, texts, and drawings, many of them

---

made by anthropologists (Deacon’s work was of particular interest and importance). Lamap men then used this material as templates to reproduce ritual artifacts, dances, and ceremonies. In this way, they have altered the temporality of historic photographs, making images of the past into dynamic objects of the present.

In 2001, I commissioned a number of ni-Vanuatu to create a new collection of objects and images, which were eventually displayed in CUMAA in the exhibition *Vanuatu Stael: Kastom and Creativity* (Geismar 2003). One of the rationales behind this exhibition, in addition to giving ni-Vanuatu a chance to participate actively in forming a collection for display and archiving abroad, was to explore the role museums have played in constructing networks of ideas between Vanuatu and Cambridge. Implicitly, the exhibition and collection investigated the ways in which images and objects migrate from place to place, influencing the ways in which people in Vanuatu, and in England, think about *kastom* (a Bislama term with a complex genealogy, broadly translatable as indigenous tradition). As part of the lengthy research process, I collected two headdresses from Lamap made by Richard Abong. These had been modeled on artifacts in the collections of the Musée du quai Branly (formerly Le Musée des Arts d’Afrique et d’Océanie), photographs of which had been brought back to Lamap by Richard’s brother, Marcellin Abong, then a curator at the VCC. In 1996, Marcellin had accompanied the traveling exhibition *Arts of Vanuatu* to Paris, where he found two headdresses collected by Admiral Bineau in Lamap over 100 years ago. He sent back photographs of these objects, and Richard was able to re-make these artifacts according to renewed criteria of authenticity (see Geismar, forthcoming).

In 2001, I talked in detail with Lamap villagers about the ways in which museums abroad had stored their *kastom* for future circulation and use. On a return visit to Vanuatu in 2003, Richard Abong told me with sadness that in the interim his sacred house had burned down, and with it all of his ceremonial paraphernalia. He was glad, however, that the headdresses he had given to Cambridge were safe. Now, he said, looking at the photographs of the artifacts in the exhibition catalogues I had brought back from Cambridge, we will *always* be able to see them again. In this way, the movement of museum objects, in the form of photographic images, back and forth between Europe and Vanuatu continues to contribute to the perpetuation of local cultural knowledge and practices. In juxtaposition to many public debates about ownership surrounding important cultural properties in museum collections, Lamap villagers do not want their sacred material to be repatriated to the village. They are more interested in the storage possibilities afforded by museums in conjunction with what might be termed ‘visual repatriation’, whereby historic photographs and photographs of historic artifacts are returned as needed, and where new objects and images may in turn be deposited in museums as investments in the future (see figure 18). Ralph
Regenvanu, the Director of the VCC iterated this point in a radio broadcast in which he described the role of the VCC archive. He commented: “This is your kastom, we are merely a bank, and any time you want to take out what your community has put in, it is your right” (in Geismar and Tilley 2003: 184).

Since the 1980s the VCC has marshaled many research projects in which archival photographs have been replaced and activated within local communities. In addition to the revivification of initiation ceremonies in Lamap, historic photographs and photographs of historic artifacts have reactivated the production of mats on Ambae (Bolton 2003), barkcloth on Erromango (Huffman 1996b), and sand drawing on Malakula, Pentecost, and Ambae (Zagala 2004). For all of these projects, the process of working with archival photographs in the field and the production of the new objects they inspired has, in turn, been re-photographed by visiting researchers and by the audiovisual crew of the VCC, creating new images of research, with the potential for future activation in communities. The National Film and Sound Unit, part of the VCC, has continued to develop its archive in collaboration with libraries, museums, and researchers around the world. It now holds the
world’s most comprehensive collection of visual material pertaining to Vanuatu and continues to develop with an agenda “to assist in the preservation and promotion of aspects of custom and culture.”

As such, both new and old archival images are explicitly conceptualized as conduits for social action. The projects mentioned above, which took as their starting point photographs of artifacts and copies of photographs in museum collections, have not only re-embedded these images back into local practices of mask-making, tapa production, mat-weaving, and sand-drawing; they have also encouraged people to create new kinds of images, both within the artistic traditions themselves, and in the extensive audio-visual documentation produced by local and foreign researchers. This analogical relationship between images and social practices has had lasting effect within communities. Respectively, these image-based projects have reopened sacred dancing grounds in Lamap and reconnected villagers to European museums; ignited the growth of a dynamic contemporary art movement on Erromango; initiated a longer dialogue across the country through the Women’s Culture Project of the VCC about women’s kastom; and spearheaded Vanuatu’s participation in the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage.

The efflorescence of ni-Vanuatu use of photographs in archives and museum collections reinforces my suggestion that photographs be viewed as agents, rather than representations, of history; active participants in making and remaking the past in the present for the future. Many of the new mats made on Ambae, or painted barkcloths on Erromango, are objects that simultaneously index historical images, their activation within research, and the contemporary ceremonies or other social practices of which they are a part.

The technologies of photographic reproduction enable these images, each an infinitely reproducible copy of a unique event or artifact, to move along multiple trajectories simultaneously. There is a historical continuity between the ways in which photographs have created analogies between photographer and photographed, between past and present, between image and object, and image and practice. All of the images discussed in this essay are part of a wider network of connection, within which ideas about change and continuity, and about anthropology, have long been circulated. Just as Lamap villagers use archival photographs to re-create dances today, or to think about how they can preserve their cultural traditions, the visually mediated negotiations between Martin Johnson and Chief Nagapate on Malakula heightened Bernard Deacon’s desire to visit and survey the Big Nambas region. Likewise, Deacon later used his own photographic practice as way to both replicate and subvert his understanding of salvage anthropology as taught by his mentor Haddon.

Photography is a technology of analogy able to mediate between the researcher’s vision and their sight, if you will, between the seeming reality

inscribed on photographic paper and glass plate and an ‘anthropological’ imagination. This technical process can, in turn, mediate relations between photographer and photographed ‘in the field’—itself a visually mediated context. The field I have presented here consists of a series of continuing connections between Malakula and Cambridge, between minds and images, between images and events, and between moments of history and their representation, all ordered within Haddon’s drawer by the taking, collection, and movement of photographs. In this sense, photo-objects take on a force of their own in the quest to know more and make sense of the changing world. It is the images themselves, collected together, juxtaposed and jostling on their cardboard mounts, that helped to forge the ethnographic imagination. Over time they have helped to constitute further images and new ideas about Malakula both in Cambridge and in Vanuatu.
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